

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/042,731 12/21/2000		12/21/2000	John Bullock	IQN0001	8862
25235	7590	04/24/2006		EXAMINER	
HOGAN &		SON LLP ER, SUITE 1500	DESHPANDE, KALYAN K		
1200 SEVENTEENTH ST				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
DENVER, (CO 8020	2	3623		
				DATE MAII ED: 04/24/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/042,731	BULLOCK ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
Kalyan K. Deshpande	3623

	Kalyan K. Deshpande	3623	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appo	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 13 April 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or of this application, applicant must timely file one of the follor places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aftotice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in content of the content o	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailir	·	in the final rejection wh	ishayaria latar In
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejecti	on.
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date	• •	36/a) and the annronria	te extension fee
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	xtension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origor than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Office.	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comfiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed.	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)	onsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	etter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a))	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.	121. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).		•	_
 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 		II be entered and an e	explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the production of t	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appery and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).
 REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered be See Continuation Sheet. 	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper I	No(s)	
13. Other:		M	1/2 -
		TARIQ R. H SUPERVISORY PATER TECHNOLOGY CER	NT EXAMINER

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to Applicant's argument Kurzius et al. and Joao fail to teach profiles with restricted portions and using restricted portions for matching, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Joao teaches restricted data for use by the external matching engine in obtaining a match for the data record (Joao: col. 14, line 61 to col. 15, line 10, and col. 23, lines 35-52). Joao teaches the use of generic terms to conceal and/or suggest attributes rather than using actual values. By using generic terms, the user is restricting hiring agents from obtaining the actual terms without the user's consent. Upon a showing of interest by a hiring agent, the user can avail the specific details. Use of generic data serves the same functionality as restricting data in that both do not disclose data the user does not wish to disclose. Additionally, the matching is done based on the information the user provides. User has the ability to set forth similar data for matching such that the matching is not affected. The example provided by Joao describes a user entering "Ivy League School" rather than entering a specific Ivy League school. This information is true information and affects the matching engine the same. Per the example provided by Applicants, a user may submit data such as "Harvard" and the matching engine will use this data for searches. If the user does not wish to submit this data, the user can put "Ivy League School" and the matching engine will still use this data for matching but will match to search requests for "Harvard". The advantage restricting data from other users is that it allows for a user to not have to disclose sensitive data. It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the feature of using generic data to the Kurzius et al. system in order to allow users to maintain a level of confidentiality, which is a goal of Joao (Joao: col. 2 line 62 to col. 3 line 8).